

**DEPARTMENT OF FORESTRY AND FIRE PROTECTION
OFFICE OF THE STATE FIRE MARSHAL**

P.O. Box 944246
SACRAMENTO, CA 94244-2460
Website: www.fire.ca.gov
(916) 445-8200



**CALIFORNIA CODE ADOPTION
Meeting Notes
Height and Area Subcommittee
December 15, 2005, 8:00am to 9:00am
Teleconference**

ATTENDEES:

Facilitators: Stuart Tom, Glendale Building

Committee or Group Members Present:

**Christina Jamison, VCFD
Laura Blaul, OCFA
Dennis Richardson, San Jose Building
Doug Williams, Rincon Valley FPD
Eddie Vasquez, DGS State Architect
Jon Traw, Laguna Woods Building
Ken Kraus, LA City Fire
Ian McDonald, Orange City Fire
Kris Head, Laguna Beach Fire**

**CDF/SFM Staff Present:
Dan Najera, SFM**

STAKEHOLDERS IN AUDIENCE:

**Mark Kluver, Portland Cement Assoc.
Rick Thornberry, The Code Consortium**

DOCUMENT HANDOUTS:

1. B Occupancy Group draft amendments to 504.2; 506.3; 506.4
2. Miscellaneous Tables presented/discussed by Mark Kluver & Dennis Richardson

AGENDA:

1. Establishment of teleconference ground rules & protocol
2. Brief discussion regarding Table Values vs. Modifiers
3. Brief discussion regarding Height vs. Area
4. Detailed discussion regarding Modifiers
5. Closing remarks

DISCUSSION/COMMENTS:

CONSERVATION IS WISE-KEEP CALIFORNIA GREEN AND GOLDEN

PLEASE REMEMBER TO CONSERVE ENERGY. FOR TIPS AND INFORMATION, VISIT "FLEX YOUR POWER" AT WWW.CA.GOV.

1. Stuart verified attendance and volunteered to prepare minutes for the meeting. As facilitator, he established the ground rules for the teleconference and instructed all participants to stay focused; the meeting would be kept to 1-hour.
2. After a brief discussion of table values and modifiers, Dennis Richardson proposed that the subcommittee start with AREA first, and revisit HEIGHT afterward. It was generally agreed that the height issues might resolve themselves through the efforts to address area. If height issues remain after the area issues are fully resolved, then those remaining height issues will be handled separately.
3. Mark Kluver proposed analyzing the MODIFIERS first, independent of the table values. This would allow an objective evaluation of the propriety of the area increases. The subcommittee agreed to this approach, with the understanding that table values would be plugged into the resulting modifiers to determine the actual “holistic” effect on each occupancy.
4. The subcommittee determined that the draft amendments prepared by Working Group No. 2 (B-Occupancy) would be a good starting point. Mark Kluver assisted the subcommittee by briefly discussing his analysis of those draft amendments. Dennis Richardson added information from a recent Tri-Chapter meeting. Rick Thornberry identified specific concerns regarding I-1 & I-2 occupancies.
5. The subcommittee generally agreed to ignore one-story situations for now, since they are not affected by the key modifiers (“double-dipping for sprinklers” and “multi-story increase”). Additionally, it was generally agreed that even two-story buildings may not be a significant issue; the multi-story effect is more pronounced for buildings 3-stories and taller.
6. Several subcommittee members discussed the need to follow-up with a look at specific occupancies, where there may still be a potential problem after the modifiers are addressed. In particular, I-1, I-2, and R-1 (especially R-1 Type III-A) occupancies were mentioned, and there may be others.
7. Dennis Richardson proposed distributing the Working Group No. 2 draft amendments, with the following modifications:
 - i) Sec. 504.2 : Do not strike text, but include exception (eliminate “double-dipping”)
 - ii) Sec. 506.3 : Do not strike/modify text, but include exception (eliminate “double-dipping”)
 - iii) Sec. 506.4 ; As drafted by Working Group No. 2
8. Mark Kluver was asked to “run the numbers” based on the proposed amendment language and distribute the results to the group for consideration.
9. Ian McDonald pointed out that in addition to considering only the occupancies for which SFM has statutory authority, it will still be important to consider ALL occupancies, since other occupancies would still be affected when located within state-owned facilities. The subcommittee also recognized that such consideration would also serve as a tool for establishing a model that could potentially be adopted at the local jurisdictional level.
10. Christina Jamison asked if other states have amended H/A. Laura Blaul commented on Seattle & and other states. The subcommittee asked Dan Najera to draft an email for Chief Grijalva to send out, which will solicit information from other enforcement authorities outside of California. John Traw commented the disposition of other states, and the subcommittee resolved to consider any information available, but to stay focused on what is best for California.
11. Stuart concluded the meeting with a round-table discussion to provide an opportunity for final comments.

ACTION ITEMS (FOLLOW UP) AND RESPONSIBLES:

1. Stuart to send a "First Cut" of AREA amendments to subcommittee members by taking Working Group No. 2 draft and modifying as discussed during the teleconference.
2. Mark Kluver to "run the numbers" for various occupancies based on the "First Cut" AREA amendments. Mark was specifically asked to include I-1, I-2, R-1 (for Type III-A construction), and any other occupancy that may result in a significant change in area.
3. Dan to draft email for Chief Grijalva's consideration, to send out to solicit information regarding the disposition of other states in amending H/A

NEXT MEETING:

TBD – Subcommittee agreed to review material that will be distributed, and will schedule the next meeting (teleconference) for some time after January 1, 2006.